

Teresa S. Renaker, Cal. Bar No. 187800  
Margaret E. Hasselman, Cal. Bar No. 228529  
RENAKER HASSELMAN LLP  
235 Montgomery St., Suite 944  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: (415) 653-1733  
Facsimile: (415) 727-5079  
[teresa@renakerhasselman.com](mailto:teresa@renakerhasselman.com)  
[margo@renakerhasselman.com](mailto:margo@renakerhasselman.com)

*Attorneys for Defendants*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

RIVERSIDE POLICE OFFICERS  
ASSOCIATION, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PEACE OFFICERS RESEARCH  
ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA  
LEGAL DEFENSE FUND, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 8:15-cv-01335-CJC-JCG

**REPLY MEMORANDUM IN  
SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS'  
MOTION TO DISMISS  
COMPLAINT AND TO  
STRIKE JURY DEMAND AND  
CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

Date: November 30, 2015

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Courtroom: 9B, Santa Ana

Judge: Hon. Cormac J. Carney

Pursuant to Local Rule 7-10, Defendants submit the following reply memorandum in support of their Motion to Dismiss Complaint and to Strike Jury Demand and Class Allegations (ECF 10). Defendants' motion should be granted for the reasons stated in their memorandum in support of the motion, and pursuant to Local Rule 7-12, because Plaintiffs have failed to file an opposition within the deadline, and so may be deemed to have consented to the granting of the motion.

On October 26, 2015, counsel for the parties held the required conference of counsel pursuant to Local Rule 7-3, at which Defendants' counsel reviewed the grounds for the motion to dismiss. (ECF 11, ¶ 2.) On October 27, 2015, Defendants' counsel sent a follow-up email to Plaintiffs' counsel with supporting authorities for several points. (*Id.*, ¶ 5.) Defendants' counsel did not receive a

1 response to this email. (*Id.*)

2 On November 2, 2015, Defendants filed their motion, together with a  
3 supporting declaration and request for judicial notice. (ECF 10, 11, 12.)  
4 Defendants requested an order dismissing the Complaint with prejudice and, to the  
5 extent not dismissed with prejudice, striking the jury demand and class allegations.  
6 (ECF 10.) Defendants noticed their motion for November 30, 2015. (*Id.*)

7 Pursuant to Local Rule 7-9, Plaintiffs were required to file their opposition  
8 to the motion, if any, no later than twenty-one days before the designated hearing  
9 date, or November 9, 2015. Plaintiffs have not filed any opposition.

10 Local Rule 7-12 provides that the failure to file any required document, or  
11 the failure to file it within the deadline, may be deemed consent to the granting of  
12 the motion.

13 Accordingly, pursuant to Local Rule 7-12, and for the reasons stated in the  
14 motion, Defendants' motion should be granted and the Complaint should be  
15 dismissed with prejudice.

16  
17 Dated: November 10, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

RENAKER HASSELMAN LLP

18 By: /s/ Teresa S. Renaker  
19 Teresa S. Renaker

20 Attorneys for Defendants  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28